

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

12th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

---

Volume XII, No. 10

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

June 1, 1982

---

## White House Aims to Shake up Agricultural R&D

The White House Science office has teamed up with the Rockefeller Foundation to sponsor a forthcoming strategy session aimed at shaking up the nation's pork-barrel dominated network of agricultural research institutions.

About 10 to 12 ag schools in the nationwide land-grant system are in tune with modern science, Denis J. Prager, Assistant Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), told the White House Science Council May 20 in a briefing that he gave on the coming meeting. The rest, he suggested, are isolated from the mainstream science departments in their institutions. In the meantime, he said, the land-grant system has increasingly focused on short-term, applied

### ***China Receiving Huge Loan For Science Education—Page 7***

problems of direct concern to state farming communities, to the neglect of scientific developments that have proven revolutionary in other areas of the life sciences.

The meeting, billed as a "small, highly focused workshop intended to develop a strategy for strengthening America's agricultural research," will be held June 14-15 at the Winrock Conference Center, Morrilton, Arkansas under the title "Workshop on Critical Issues in Agricultural Research." Participation has been limited to 14 persons, drawn from academe, government, high-tech industry, and think tanks.

The theme of scientific backwardness in an agricultural-research enterprise that now absorbs nearly \$900 million a year in federal funds has been repeatedly voiced over the past decade by scientific critics outside ag's comfortably insulated system of formula grants. Berating that system from the perspective of peer-reviewed competition for federal research funds, these critics, mainly in the non-ag sectors of academe, got a small competitive grants program going, but otherwise aroused little political backing for their revisionist views.

The difference now is that the Reagan-induced upheaval in federal science policy nicely dovetails with the old criticisms of intellectual sluggishness in ag research, protected enclaves, and an absence of clear boundaries between private and public responsibilities. What isn't different, however, is Capitol Hill's backing for the entrenched system, which has a well-organized

nationwide constituency that likes things just as they are.

"A look at the really exciting biological research in this country that is applicable to agriculture," Prager told the Council, shows that "a relatively small percentage of it goes on in the land-grant system."

Offering what he emphasized is "a personal opinion," Prager said that the "land-grant system is in a mode of self-destruction in that it has not adapted well to" outside institutions in the forefront of the biological sciences. "In trying to protect itself," he continued, "the land-grant system is losing some credibility and losing support and becoming more and more isolated." As competition has increased for federal research funds, the land-grant schools, "instead of trying to find a way" to partake in advanced research, have "tended to circle the wagons and try to keep the other people out. So, there is this problem of the adaptation of this tradition

*(Continued on page 2)*

## In Brief

"The aim is to correct the problems, not get rid of labs," David Packard, head of a White House Science Council panel on the future of the national labs, told a Council meeting last week. Packard, Chairman of the Board of Hewlett-Packard, expressed distaste for layoffs at the labs. "You're not going to have a very reliable system," he said, "if you come to the end of the line and fire 1000 people." Other jobs or transitional arrangements should be provided in cases where programs or whole labs are eliminated, Packard said.

*The Department of Agriculture has dropped loyalty checks for members of its peer-review panels after the general press picked up reports of the practice from Science magazine. What remains to be seen now is whether the Veterans Administration, which has so far escaped the spotlight, goes through with arrangements for setting up its own system of loyalty checks on peer reviewers.*

*One of the biggest new packages of money for academe—the Defense Department's \$30-million special fund for laboratory equipment—faces an uncertain future as the once-sacrosanct Defense budget goes into the deficit-cutting mill. The money, originally scheduled to start flowing next October 1, was the only federal equipment fund specifically earmarked for university labs.*

## ...Most Ag Scientists "Isolated on Campus"

(Continued from page 1)

tional system to the new biology and the new ways that research is done in this country." Prager, a PhD physiologist, has been a member of the White House science office since 1978.

Referring to the small program of agricultural competitive grants that was started during the Carter Administration, Prager pointed out that it represented a break with agriculture's tradition of formula and block grants—and that year after year, it has encountered heavy political opposition. "It has struggled and struggled throughout its existence not to be wiped out, essentially by the traditional forces in agriculture who are concerned that these funds that go out on a competition can go to any institution, whether it be inside the land-grant system or outside."

The Arkansas meeting, he said, "is to discuss these kinds of issues. Essentially, we will discuss the institutional issues facing agricultural research, and we will attempt to develop a strategy for dealing with those issues; in other words, coming out with an action plan, if we can, of things which the federal government ought to do through our office and the Department of Agriculture, and what the land-grant system ought to do."

Prager said that OSTP Director George A. Keyworth, who was not present during the briefing, had expressed interest in the possibility of having the White House Science Council take an active interest in the agricultural research issues.

The Council drifted off into idle discussion after Prager said he would report on the Arkansas strategy conference at the Council's next bi-monthly meeting. Nonetheless, it was a revealing discussion, opening with Council Chairman Solomon J. Buchsbaum—Executive Vice President of Bell Labs—wisecracking to his colleagues, "Not many farmers around this table."

Not all the ag schools are scientifically backward, Prager said. "A number of these schools are really excellent," he said—among them the University of Wisconsin, the University of California, and Cornell. "In many of those schools," he continued, "the agriculture departments and the other departments are well-integrated."

### Conference Participants

*The following are listed as participants in the Workshop on Critical Issues in Agricultural Research:*

Perry Adkisson, Deputy Chancellor for Agriculture, Texas A&M University System  
 James T. Bonnen, Professor of Economics, Michigan State University  
 Winslow R. Briggs, Director, Department of Plant Biology, Carnegie Institution of Washington  
 Rep. George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.), House Agriculture Committee  
 Emery Castle, President, Resources for the Future  
 Irwin Feller, Director, Institute for Policy Research and Evaluation, University Park, Pennsylvania  
 Ralph Hardy, Central Research and Development, E.I. DuPont  
 James B. Kendrick, Jr., Vice President, Agriculture & University Services, University of California  
 Lowell Lewis, Assistant Vice President, Agriculture & University Services, University of California  
 James Martin, President, University of Arkansas  
 John Marvel, General Manager, Research Division, Monsanto Agricultural Products Company  
 John A. Pino, Director for Agricultural Sciences, Rockefeller Foundation  
 Denis J. Prager, Assistant Director, Office of Science & Technology Policy  
 Peter van Schaik, Associate Area Director, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service

"What do you mean?" a Council member asked.

"They're on the same campus and they share faculty and they teach some courses together," Prager replied. "And in those cases, the formula funds that come from government are a tiny percentage of what they get, because those are sophisticated schools; they get competitive funding from NIH and NSF and DOE...On the other hand there are a lot of other land-grant schools which are not nearly as good and in which the agricultural science is very isolated, and in which that kind of intercourse just does not happen," he added.

"There is a tendency, on the campus as well as nationally, for the agricultural scientists to be isolated,"

(Continued on page 3)

### ©Science & Government Report, Inc., 1982

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

Associate Publisher  
**Wanda J. Reif**

Circulation Manager  
**Diane Kupelian**

#### Contributing Correspondents

**Christopher Joyce, Kim A. McDonald (Washington); Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)**

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$127.50 (two years, \$220.00); individuals, \$55.00 (two years, \$95.00). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

## ...Land-Grant Community “A Closed Society”

(Continued from page 2)

Prager said. They have their own source of funding in the Department of Agriculture, and they have their own journals, and they go to their own meetings. The land-grant community is a very closed community. They have their own association, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), which is politically very powerful. And it really in some ways is a closed society.

“If they decide,” Prager continued, “that you are not on their side, that you are raising questions about the way this land-grant community operates, they will lock you out of that community. . .”

Asked to describe the status of the Department of Agriculture’s competitive grants program, Prager replied that the Reagan Administration was encountering the same opposition that the Carter Administration had experienced. Both regularly sought to increase funds for the program, “and each year, the House Appropriations Committee—[Rep.] Jamie Whitten [D-Miss., Chairman of the Appropriations Committee]—has ‘zeroed’ it. And it’s only through the Senate that we’ve been able to get a compromise, which is essentially keeping it a flat budget each year. So, we’ve still got this meager \$15 million which we’re trying to focus to do high-quality basic science.”

A Council member asked whether NASULGC sup-

ported the competitive budget.

“Officially,” Prager replied, “NASULGC and individuals support it. But, through the back door, there is a consortium, a coalition, particularly of Southern land-grant deans and directors who oppose it and who have gotten to Whitten and Whitten has opposed it.”—DSG

### An Invitation

Written on White House stationery, the letters of invitation to the Workshop on Critical Issues in Agricultural Research describe the meeting “as the first step in a process designed to critically analyze this country’s agricultural research enterprise and identify actions designed to strengthen that enterprise.”

Signed by Denis J. Prager, with the title of Assistant Director, Office of the Science Advisor to the President, the letter paints a gloomy picture of the condition of agricultural research and states that the “need for... strengthening seems clear.”

National dependence on agricultural productivity “creates the pressure of expectations for America’s agricultural research enterprise to sustain the phenomenal level of success it has achieved over the past 100 years,” the letter states.

“Yet,” it continues, “there is considerable evidence

(Continued on page 4)

## Background Paper Discusses NIH Model for Agriculture

*A paper by James T. Bonnen, Professor of Economics, Michigan State University, provides an authoritative backdrop for the forthcoming Workshop on Critical Issues in Agricultural Research. Titled “Agriculture’s System of Developmental Institutions: Reflections on the US Experience,” the paper was delivered last October at an agriculture symposium at the University of Laval, Quebec. Following are excerpts:*

The nearly complete monopoly of both biological research and the communication of new biological knowledge and technologies to farmers, which the [land-grant] Colleges and the US Department of Agriculture once had, is gone. Such innovations as hybrid corn, other new plant hybrids, high-protein animal feeds, high-analysis fertilizers and the inputs of the chemical revolution are predominantly private-sector activities. . . The genetic engineering of the characteristics of plants is already so attractive to proprietary firms that they are now raiding US university faculties. . . Today the overwhelming majority of dollars

spent on agricultural research are expended by private firms...

This raises serious questions about the future roles of the public and private sectors as sources of new knowledge in agriculture. [It has been suggested] that if public research investments are to earn a high rate of return, they must be moved more toward basic research. This is no doubt true, but the Colleges will still have to be concerned to maintain the applied research necessary to protect their state’s competitive advantage in agriculture and they must keep a general presence in applied research or expect to see the extension service slowly die for lack of support for its mission. . .

Sadly, for all its past accomplishments. . . USDA [is] now unavoidably dominated by clientele with narrow economic interests. It is likely that national agricultural research must be free of that environment before it will be allowed to perform its function properly. One model that comes to mind is that of the National Institutes of Health. A National Institute of Agriculture probably should be independent of the USDA but responsible to the agriculture committees of Congress. . .

## US Cuts off Science Exchange with Poland

The chill between Poland and the US has claimed scientific cooperation as its victim. Amid charges by the Polish news media that American scientists in Warsaw are engaged in spying, and after a raid by Polish police on a meeting of Polish scientists and American diplomats, the State Department has decided to end the bilateral program that the two countries commenced in 1974.

The precipitating event took place on the evening of May 9 in Warsaw, when two American diplomats—John Zerolis, Scientific Attaché, and J. Daniel Howard, Cultural Affairs Officer—met with two Polish scientists, Ryszard Herczynski and Wladyslaw Fiszdon, at Herczynski's apartment. The purpose of the meeting, according to the State Department, was to discuss a visit to Warsaw by an official of the National Science Foundation in connection with a research project sponsored by the two governments under the exchange program.

According to the State Department, Zerolis and Howard reported that as they were about to leave, "A number of individuals burst into the apartment, showing no identification whatsoever," and then "manhandled them, and spreadeagled them against the

wall and searched them."

When one of the Americans produced an identification card, the intruders "threw his ID across the room." A photographer took about 50 snapshots. A member of the group, presumed by the State Department to be police officers, also confiscated three Solidarity bulletins (underground publications of the outlawed union) and two copies of proposals for scientific exchange grants.

The American ambassador, Francis J. Meehan, protested the raid the following day to the Polish government, but the State Department says no explanation was given. However, on May 12, the US Foreign Broadcast Information Service, which monitors foreign media, picked up a report from the Polish press accusing visiting American scientists of committing espionage in Poland. Though half the visiting scientists have come to establish legitimate relationships with Polish colleagues, said the report, "it is not hard to note that for many persons...this has been a mere pretext." Certain visitors, it continued, had "totally different interests and had made contacts with 'activists on the Solidarity payroll.'" In the meantime, Zerolis and Howard were given until May 14 to leave the country.

The State Department directly retaliated, on May 13, by ordering the expulsion of the Polish Attaché for Science and Technology, Andrzej Koroscik, and a political officer, Mariusz Wozniak. They were given until midnight, May 17, to leave Washington. And the scientific exchange agreement, hobbled since martial law was declared but still alive, was suspended indefinitely.

The exchange program began in the early 1970s, allowing scientists from American universities and Polish institutions to travel back and forth, at a rate of about 100 from each country every year. In 1974, Poland began matching US expenditures in a joint fund, consisting entirely of zlotys, that over the past 10 years has contained a total of about \$40 million, according to a State Department source. The exchange covers the gamut of disciplines, but has concentrated especially on agriculture, public health, and energy topics.

Arrangements are typically made between US academics and their Polish colleagues, with eight US federal agencies sponsoring travel in the US, and institutions like the Polish Academy of Sciences taking care of visits to Poland.

The two Polish scientists in the Warsaw raid have been collaborating for 11 years with a Stanford Professor of Chemical Engineering, Andreas Acrivos, but their official relationship began only in 1980. For several years prior to that, the Polish government refused

*(Continued on page 5)*

### INVITATION *(Continued from page 3)*

that this enterprise—at least the federal-state partnership, traditionally thought of as comprising the enterprise—is in failing health, not able to sustain its level of past performance and not up to meeting our high expectations of it." The letter continues:

"If American agriculture is to survive and flourish as it must if America is to survive and flourish, we have to be assured of the continued development of new knowledge and technologies through agricultural research. Assuring future scientific and technological advances for agriculture will require that we mobilize all appropriate resources including those of the Federal Government, state land-grant colleges, other state and private colleges and universities, non-profit research institutes, and the business and industrial sectors.

"Accordingly, we are inviting a select group of individuals from government, universities, and the private sector to participate in two days of concentrated, unstructured discussions focused on: (1) assessing the degree to which the agricultural research enterprise is up to meeting the challenges it faces; (2) developing a strategy for strengthening that enterprise and mobilizing the public and private sector energy and resources required to assure its future success; and (3) defining specific next steps in implementing the strategy. Although we recognize the integral roles of teaching and extension, the workshop will focus primarily on research."

## New Commissioner Thwarts Clinch River Ploy

The Administration has made another desperate try to get the Clinch River (Tenn.) Breeder Reactor approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, but this time failed on an unexpected "no" vote by its handpicked selection for the most recent vacancy on the five-member body.

Breeder watchers may remember the 3-2 vote last March to reject the Department of Energy's request to start building the breeder before getting a full-fledged license from NRC. Having lost that skirmish, DOE Deputy Secretary Ken Davis bided his time, waiting for what looked like the right moment to try again. The opportunity seemed to appear on May 14.

On that day, two of the March naysayers, Commissioners Victor Gilinsky and John Ahearne, were out of town. The other, Peter Bradford, had resigned, to be replaced by James Asselstine, formerly a Senate aide and an unknown, but reputedly sympathetic, quantity. Asselstine had just been approved the day before in the Senate. That left breeder backers Chairman Nunzio

Palladino and Thomas Roberts, and Asselstine, still to be sworn in, as a presumed majority.

As it happened, DOE's Davis chose Friday the 14th to file a request for reconsideration of the March vote—one day before the appeal period expired. Sure enough, Palladino called a meeting Monday at 3 pm to vote on Davis's motion. Asselstine had been sworn in as the fifth commissioner that morning. Ahearne had flown back to Washington over the weekend, so the head count was two for, one against, and one unknown.

Not that Asselstine wasn't intimately familiar with Clinch River. As Majority Counsel for the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, the young lawyer knew well the strong emotions raised by the Clinch River project, especially in the heart of Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, of Tennessee, who is commonly credited with maintaining life in the comatose project.

Sizing up his first meeting, Commissioner Asselstine didn't like the looks of it. "It is impossible to ignore the last-minute nature of the Department [of Energy's] request for reconsideration," he observed. Considering the circumstances surrounding his confirmation, which Asselstine said created the impression that his support of the breeder would be a "foregone conclusion," the "11th hour request" by DOE cast an ugly shadow, he suggested. As Asselstine put it, a yea vote would "raise serious questions about objectivity and independence of the Commission decision today" and give "at least the appearance of a hasty and ill-considered judgment on my part."

Asselstine voted along with Ahearne to send DOE packing, while, predictably, Roberts and Palladino voted for the exemption request. The tied vote automatically killed the motion. The only consolation the new NRC man had for DOE was a suggestion that it might try again.

## Diet and Cancer Report Due

*Diet, Nutrition, and Cancer*, a 700-page report based on a two-year study by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences, is scheduled for public release June 16 at a press conference at the Academy.

The committee, chaired by Clifford Grobstein, Professor of Biological Sciences and Public Policy at UC San Diego, conducted the study—basically a literature search and analysis—under a contract of nearly \$1 million from the National Cancer Institute. The report is intended mainly for cancer researchers, but also includes dietary recommendations for the general public. Next on the agenda for the committee is a report recommending a research program on diet and cancer.

### **POLAND** (Continued from page 4)

ed to permit an official exchange because, says Acrivos, Herczynski "was not in the good graces of the Polish authorities." In fact, shortly after martial law was imposed, Herczynski was arrested briefly. He reportedly was arrested again after the May 9 raid. Acrivos, who traveled to Warsaw in June 1981 to visit his collaborators, says Fiszdon commands considerable respect in Poland as the former Vice Chancellor of the University of Warsaw and a member of the Polish Academy of Sciences, and probably has not been detained. Herczynski is a research scientist at the Polish Academy's Institute of Fundamental Technological Research.

As Acrivos describes it, the meeting in Herczynski's apartment took place in part because of his inability to communicate with the collaborators. "Since martial law, the mail is very inefficient," Acrivos said, "so I have been communicating through the American Embassy and they've been giving [Acrivos's letters] to Herczynski."

While the end of the program is "not a disaster" to his work, says Acrivos, "It affects the efficiency of the process" of collaboration. Although the State Department could not pinpoint how many US and Polish scientists are now in each others' countries, a State official estimated the figures at no more than 10 each. In recent years, quite a few major American universities have been involved in exchanges, including MIT, several campuses of the University of California, Yale, the State University of New York, University of Massachusetts, Ohio State University, and Penn State.—CJ

## Reagan Message Cooly Received at NAS Education Meeting

The general impression that emerged from last month's convocation at the National Academy of Sciences on decay in science and math education is that the meeting caught the Administration flat-footed and adds up to an embarrassment for the White House.

Though the 600 or so who assembled for the two-day meeting (SGR Vol. XII, No. 8) were obviously drawn mainly from nostalgists for big federal spending on elementary and secondary science and math programs, the Administration's performance was so aloof and indifferent that even the open-minded were a bit offended.

A Presidential message was brought to the meeting by Edwin L. Harper, Director of the White House Office of Policy Development. But the remarks recited by Harper were harsh in tone and elicited only polite applause.

Referring to the elimination of the National Science Foundation's education programs—a subject much in the forefront at the meeting—the Reagan message stated:

"This Administration has deliberately suspended what had become a proliferation of small federal programs which—taken together—showed

themselves to be ineffective in stemming the slide in science and math performance that has been evident for at least a decade. Today's situation didn't develop overnight, but over a period of many years—in spite of all these federal programs."

The message continued: "This country was built on American respect for education. Somehow, in recent years, many Americans have lost some of the conviction that knowledge and hard work are the keys to achievement and success. Our challenge now is to create a resurgence of that thirst for education that typifies our nation's history. I know those of you attending this convocation are committed to that goal."

That same morning, Reagan's coolly received emissary was followed to the podium by Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio), who, in his early-starting quest for the Democratic Presidential nomination, has been accusing the Administration of destructive neglect of the nation's schools and research and development resources (SGR Vol. XII, No. 5).

Glenn harped on that theme in his talk to the assemblage, and got the most enthusiastic applause of the convocation.

## Growth in Science Jobs Reported by NSF

### Percent distribution by job sector: 1980

Field	Business/ industry	Educa- tional institu- tions	Federal Govern- ment	All others
<b>Total</b> .....	59	18	9	14
Physical sciences .....	53	25	9	13
Mathematical sciences .....	35	44	11	10
Computer specialties...	74	11	6	9
Environmental sciences .....	51	18	16	15
Engineers .....	77	5	17	11
Life sciences .....	28	41	13	18
Psychology .....	16	40	12	42
Social sciences .....	23	37	12	28

and computer specialties. There's been an increase in the number of women engineers, but as of 1980, they constituted only 2 percent of the profession.

- Employment for statisticians increased by 40 percent, while jobs for physical scientists declined by 2 percent.

(The report, NSF 82-303, is available without charge from Division of Science Resources Studies, National Science Foundation, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.)

While about 11 percent of employed persons trained in science and engineering were working outside those fields in the 1978-80 period, research and development as a "primary work activity" experienced substantial growth, up by about 14 percent, to a total of 800,000 jobs. The big gainer, NSF reports, was basic research, which grew by almost 20 percent; the growth was in educational institutions and in industry and business. Other findings from that 1978-80 period:

- Women in the science and engineering population increased from 10 to about 13 percent of the total. Female scientists are concentrated in several fields, and constitute at least one-fifth of the totals in the psychological, social, life, and mathematical sciences,

## \$200-Million Loan Aids Chinese Universities

The World Bank says that its money has at last started to flow into what well may be the largest financial uplift ever aimed at a nation's system of higher education—a \$325-million development program for science and engineering in 26 universities in the People's Republic of China.

The money—\$200 million divided between hard and soft loans from the Bank, plus a PRC contribution of \$125 million in goods, services, and buildings—is the World Bank's first loan to China. Negotiations and planning started about two years ago, but the first segment of the loan didn't go out until May 20.

The spending plan that has been agreed upon calls for devoting \$150 million to the purchase of research equipment, and \$50 million to underwrite fellowships at foreign institutions for 800 Chinese students—300 on short-term visits and the remainder for long-term graduate studies—plus visits to China by foreign specialists. The program covers chemistry, physics, engineering, and computer sciences. A separate agreement with the Bank, covering the agricultural sciences at 11 Chinese colleges and seven research institutes, is under discussion; the sum for that one is reported to be \$75 million.

The deadline for bids on the first batch of equipment—for which \$70 million has been allotted—is in July. Bank officials say that the opportunity to provide the first advanced equipment for China's reawakening university system has stirred a lot of interest among manufacturers in several countries. After that first lot has been contracted for, bids will be sought for the remaining \$80 million in the equipment fund.

To help guide this undertaking, a five-member advisory committee, drawn from the US, Britain, France, West Germany, and Japan, is being established. So far, only the Chairman has been announced: Dale Corson, President-emeritus of Cornell University.

### *Pro-Lifers Assail NIH Chief*

James Wyngaarden, the new Director of the National Institutes of Health, has received a swift introduction to the perils of public candor in Washington.

An apparently relaxed and easy-going fellow, Wyngaarden, in his first press conference as NIH Director (SGR Vol. XII, No. 9) calmly fielded a volatile question about NIH and abortion with a response that included: "I believe the abortion decision should be an individual decision. I believe in the freedom of choice, and that the NIH should provide the maximum scientific basis on which intelligent choices can be made... It's a couple's decision to make, not a legislative decision..."

Shortly after his words were in print, three abortion groups demanded that the Administration dismiss him and those responsible for his appointment. A representative of the American Life Lobby was quoted as calling his appointment "a direct slap in the face to the pro-life movement" and "an absolute insult."

There's no sign that Wyngaarden is bothered by the outcry. But what's being noted with interest in biomedical-policy circles in Washington is the unexplained delay in scheduling a public ceremonial swearing in for the new Director. For legal purposes, the oath of office was privately administered to Wyngaarden on April 30 by Thomas S. McFee, Assistant Secretary for Personnel Administration at the Department of Health and Human Services. It was understood, however, that a public ceremony, with HHS Secretary Richard S. Schweiker administering the oath, would be held shortly afterwards. As of late last month, however, the Director's office had no word on the second swearing in ceremony.

### *Birch Bayh Lobbying for ACS*

A lobbying team headed by former Senator Birch Bayh (D-Ind.) has signed on with the American Cancer Society, but it's not yet clear whether that means that the ACS is going to abandon its traditional political timidity and wade into legislative fights over industrial carcinogens. ACS is paying \$155,000 a year for the services of Bayh and company, fairly modest by big-league Washington lobbying standards.

So far there's no sign that the switch to Bayh signifies political venturesomeness on the part of the ACS, which, with an annual take of nearly \$200 million, is by far the biggest of the health charities. An ACS spokesman said that top priority on the capital scene has been assigned to protection of cigarette health warnings, currently under attack at the Reaganite Federal Trade Commission, and support for the sagging budget of the National Cancer Institute.

Bayh, whose first wife died of breast cancer, was defeated for re-election in 1980. The arrangement with ACS is through his law firm, Bayh, Tabbert and Capehart. Bayh will supervise and participate in the lobbying effort, while another partner in the firm devotes half time to the cause. In addition Louise Milone, a former staff member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which Bayh was a subcommittee chairman, will work full-time on ACS business.

With the exception of cigarettes, which have long been safe to slam in public, ACS has traditionally steered away from politically sensitive issues.

## Bigger Cut of Pie Draws Fire to National Labs

Concerns about alleged deficiencies of "quality" and "excellence" are often expressed by academic and industrial detractors of the Department of Energy's nine big multi-program laboratories. But in the absence of evidence—and no one has yet produced it—that these labs aren't up to some reasonable standard of quality, it would be prudent to look elsewhere for the motivations for sniping. And, as is often the case in these matters, the search need extend no further than the topic of money.

In recent years, the nine labs—see the accompanying table for the list of them—have been consuming ever-increasing shares of a federal R&D budget for which there are many claimants who feel shortchanged. Thus, according to background papers prepared for a panel looking into the labs for DOE's Energy Research Advisory Board, the nine's share of Federal R&D funds rose from 5.9 percent in 1970 to 7.6 percent in 1977 and 9.1 percent in 1981.

During the 1970-81 period, the labs also reached out to sources other than DOE (and its organizational ancestors) to increase their share of federal funding. In 1970, the Atomic Energy Commission provided 65 percent of their support. By 1981, when their share of federal funds had experienced a near-doubling in one decade, DOE provided only 45 percent of their budgets.

From 1978 to 1982, the percentage of funds for the labs coming from outside of DOE rose from 10.2 to 15.2 percent.

Meanwhile, with the 1973 energy crisis providing a big political boost, employment at the labs came off a three-year plateau and, in the aggregate, grew substantially until Reaganite budget cuts caused a slight droop. Here are the figures:

### Employment at the Big Nine

	1971	1974	1980	1982 (est.)
Ames	665	520	643	560
Argonne	4435	4114	4925	4100
Brookhaven	2639	2473	3547	3219
Lawrence	2363	2200	3092	2829
Livermore	5239	5394	7325	7500
Los Alamos	4013	4711	7061	6966
Oak Ridge	3924	3767	5142	4900
Pacific Northwest	1240	1645	2673	2575
Sandia	7297	6477	7847	7685
<b>Total Labs</b>				
<b>Employment</b>	<b>31,815</b>	<b>31,301</b>	<b>42,255</b>	<b>40,334</b>

The panel, chaired by Ivan Bennett, Dean and Provost of the New York University Medical Center, is due to report in September.

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station  
Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid  
at Washington, D.C.

9999

Xerox-University Microfilms  
300 N. Zeeb Rd  
Ann Arbor

MI 48106

